

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 28, 2009. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

The specification has been amended to correct an error in the reference numeral on page 45, lines 17-18. No new matter has been added.

Claim 7 has been rewritten into independent form, including all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Claims 1-6 and 9-11 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §112:

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 and 9-11 have been cancelled. This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

As noted above, claims 1 and 2 have been incorporated into claim 7. However, the antecedent basis issues present in claims 1 and 2 have been corrected in independent claim 7. Specifically, claim 7 recites “a remote control unit”. Claim 7 has also been amended to recite that the command judging section “selectively outputs one of the first and second commands by judging which command is to serve as effective”. This clarifies the language identified by the Examiner and makes it clear that the commands are judged and then one is selected as effective. This language also clarifies how “effective” is used in the claim to mean that the command that is judged “effective” is the command that is used by the control signal receiving apparatus.

In addition, claim 10 recites “a command comparing section” in line 2 of the claim. Therefore, it is submitted that “the command comparing section” does have antecedent basis in the claim.

Finally, claims 7-8 and 12-13 have been amended to recite “command” instead of “reception command” to address the Examiner’s concern that “reception command” was indefinite in light of the specification. Therefore it is submitted that claims 7-8 and 12-13 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention. As a result, claims 7-8 and 12-13 are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. Claim 3 has been cancelled. This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 1 has been incorporated into claim 7.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite a “control signal receiving apparatus which can receive a control signal from a remote control unit both directly from the remote control and indirectly through a data receiving apparatus which is connected to the control signal receiving apparatus”. The direct reception capability has now been established in the claim. Therefore it is submitted that claim 7 is now complete and in compliance with 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C §102(b):

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(a) as being anticipated by Nagata (JP 2003/179985). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103(a):

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata (JP 2003/179985) in view of Ishiguro (US 4,751,581). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Claims 5, 6, 9, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata (JP 2003/179985). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claims 5, 6, 9, and 11 have been cancelled.

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata (JP 2003/179985) in view of Satoh (US 6,569,138). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 10 has been cancelled.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidekazu SUZUKI et al.

By /Allen N. Doyel/
2010.01.28 16:54:57 -05'00'

Allen N. Doyel
Registration No. 60,391
Attorney for Applicants

AND/JRF/clw
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 29, 2010